

21 MAY 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: Assistant Deputy Director for Support
SUBJECT : Management Advisory Group Recommendations

Bob:

Hugh carried the discussion on the CT Program and I'm sure he will respond to your query on the CT paper. My impression at the conclusion of Hugh's line by line refutation of the Group's paper was that "they" were not convinced. I say "they" but I believe only two or three members of the Group feel strongly about the CT Program and the probationary issue. They did accept the fact that the Agency needed some recruitment technique to accommodate generalists. Their solution to this requirement was for Personnel to have some slots against which generalists would be hired. We then explained that Personnel would want to share the responsibility of selection and that training, much the same as now provided the CT's, would be required. Further, if the "generalists" were to find their niche and be exposed to at least two Directorates, we would have a CT Program but under another name. The Group was asked to come up with a constructive recommendation to replace the CT Program.

On the discussion of the probationary period recommendation we had much the same results--"they" were not convinced. Despite my explanation of the injustice that could result from a quota system and the greatly increased emphasis that we were going to give to the three-year probationary period review (and you will soon be reviewing our significant modifications of this program), they still believed that managers would not get rid of the unqualified unless they were given an arbitrary quota.

On the positive side, I plan to send the finished package on the new three-year review procedures to the MAG and hopefully they will see in it the potential to at least partially achieve their goals.

SIGNED

Harry B. Fisher

Distribution:

- O & 1 - Addressee
- 1 - D/Pers Chrono
- 1 - D/Pers Subj
- X - D/Training